

Claims 1-16 are in the application with claims 1-8, 10, 11 and 13-15 being rejected or objected to as dependent on rejected claims and the remaining claims being withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-5, 14 and 15 have been rejected as improper Markush claims because of the definition of R_3 . The Examiner has indicated that the restriction of R_3 to -COOH and -COO alkyl would overcome the rejection and claim 1 has been amended accordingly. The Amendment would also serve to remove the rejection of the other, dependent claims which were rejected for the same reason.

With the cancellation of claims 2 and 4, the rejection of claims 1 and 3 on the basis that there is no proper distinction from claims 2 and 4 respectively, is no longer applicable. The objection to certain of the claims (claims 6-8, 10, 11 and 13) as dependent from rejected claims would also no longer be applicable because the rejections involved were removed by the above cancellation or the earlier amendments.

Finally, claim 14 has been amended to indicate the use of an effective amount of the compound for a specific pharmaceutical use and this serves to overcome the rejection of that claim for failing to include such information.

The amendments and discussion presented above clearly remove all bases for the rejection of the claims involved.

An early and favorable reconsideration of the present application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Cincinnati, Ohio 45215
Telephone: (513) 948-7964

May 1, 1980


John J. Kolano, Reg. No. 20,603
Acting in a Representative
Capacity